

REMARKS

Applicant provides the following remarks in support of the patentability of the claims and respectfully requests the Examiner's careful consideration in that regard.

This response is in reply to the Office Notice of 13 March 2008, wherein the Examiner informs Applicant that his previously filed response did not fully address the issues raised in the Office action being responded to.

The Drawings Have Been Corrected

In the Notice, the Examiner points out that "Applicant failed to address the sequence rule objection to the specification, namely that Sequence identifiers are missing from the sequences in pg 52, line 18."

Counsel carefully reviewed the application as filed and as found in his file and can find no page 52 in the specification. Please remember that this application was filed two law firms previously. Counsel did find an amendment which added page 51. However, following page 51, counsel found only FIGS. 1-8. Accordingly, counsel believes the Examiner is referring to the sequences shown in FIG. 1, which would have been page 52 and which is originally labeled as "A. Native IGF-1" for the top panel and "B. Synthetic IGF-1" for the bottom panel. The enclosed replacement sheet for FIG. 1 has been corrected to add the sequence identifiers "SEQ ID NO:1" to the A top panel and "SEQ ID NO:2" to the B bottom panel.

Additionally, replacement sheets for FIGS. 5 and 7 are enclosed. These were originally prepared by the inventor for a scientific publication and, consequently, they are in color. After copying several times, the text within the various boxes became obscured. Applicant does point out that these same figures were published in the parent application, PCT/US03/21159. The replacement sheets contain no new matter.

Regarding FIG. 8, the inventor cannot locate an original in his computer records. FIG. 8 is shown and explained in the Brief Description of the Drawings in published application US 2007/0124838. Applicant acknowledges that writing inside the black arrows at the top of the figure is somewhat obscured but points out that the significance of each arrow is also clearly shown in the text displayed above each of the arrows. Applicant believes that this overlying text provides sufficient explanation for the skilled to understand the figure. Additionally, counsel has searched the published application electronically and finds that FIG. 8, as noted in its brief description, is merely included as a general example of a vector that might be employed in the invention. In fact, following its brief description, FIG. 8 is not again referred to in the specification. Accordingly, it would appear that FIG. 8 is merely an explanatory general illustration that could be omitted from the application without significant loss. For that reason, if the Examiner feels that the text legends shown above the arrows are insufficient for clear understanding of the figure, Applicant would agree to having the figure and its brief description deleted from the application by Examiner's amendment.

Conclusion

Having responded to the last remaining concerns noted by the Examiner, Applicant now believes the application should be in condition for allowance and respectfully requests such action.

If the further processing of the application could be facilitated through a telephone conference between the Examiner and the undersigned, the Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

/Henry Estevez/
Enrique G. Estévez, PhD
Atty. Reg. No. 37,823
Allen, Dyer, Doppelt, Milbrath & Gilchrist, P.A.
255 S. Orange Ave., Suite 1401
P. O. Box 3791
Orlando, Florida 32802
(407) 841-2330